



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,608	06/04/2007	Sture Sjoo	47113-5095	2673
55694	7590	03/03/2010	EXAMINER	
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC) 1500 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209			FRIDIE JR, WILLMON	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3724		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,608	Applicant(s) SJOO ET AL.
	Examiner WILL FRIDIE JR	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-14 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 5,7 and 8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaengerle (4913604) in view of Miller (Re. 21068), David et al. 4946318 and WO 2004062839.

Zaengerle (4913604) lacks the disclosure of serrations arranged on one of its main surfaces and extending parallel to its toothed edge.

Miller discloses a slot milling cutter, which comprises insert seats provided with first serrations and cutting inserts provided with second serrations which are arranged on at least one main surface of the cutting inserts; where the first and second serrations extend in the axial direction of the slot milling cutter.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to provide the insert of Zaengerle with the serrations of Miller to insure a firmer connection between the elements.

Zaengerle lacks the disclosure of serrated surfaces on both sides of the main surfaces. WO 2004062839 discloses such an arrangement comprising serrations (40, 60). It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention to provide Zaengerle with serrations on both sides in the manner as taught by WO 2004062839 in order to improve the rigidity of the insert when connected to a cutting head. With respect to claim 8, Zaengerle lacks the disclosure of two opposed toothed edge sides. David et al discloses such an arrangement. It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to provide Zaengerle with two opposed toothed edges in the manner as taught by David et al. in order to provide an indexing capability to the tool when the edges are worn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1-4 and 9-14 are allowable.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that claim 5 recites "wherein the cutting insert has serrations on both the main surfaces thereof" and "the serrations extend parallel to the toothed edge side of the cutting insert." And that none of the cited references disclose at least this combination of elements.

The examiner submits that all of the elements claimed by applicant are clearly found in the prior art (as shown by the cited references). And to combine these references to produce the claimed subject matter would have been well within the level of one skilled in the art.

Further, the examiner submits that the rationale to modify or combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rationale may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, established scientific principles, or legal precedent established by prior case law. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Hence, since all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed and use them in an off the shelf manner known to those in the industry with no change in their respective functions, such that the claimed elements would perform their known functions and the combination of elements would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Further, in response to applicant's inference that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references; the examiner submits that reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILL FRIDIE JR whose telephone number is (571)272-4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ASHLEY BOYER can be reached on 571 272 4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wf
/Willmon Fridie/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724